

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

KAREN M. ISAACSON,  
Plaintiff,

v.

MARCIA L. FUDGE, Secretary of HUD;  
JULIA R. GORDON, Assistant Secretary of  
HUD and Federal Housing Administration  
Commissioner; and UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-000351-JHC

ORDER

Before the court is self-represented Plaintiff Karen M. Isaacson's motion for reconsideration of the court's order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss. Dkt. # 22; *see also* Dkt. ## 21, 16. Having reviewed the motion, pertinent portions of the record, and the governing law, the court DENIES the motion.

"Motions for reconsideration are disfavored," and the Court "will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1). "Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy," and the moving party bears a "heavy burden." *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Est. of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000).

1 Isaacson seeks reconsideration of the Court's order, contending that certain cases  
2 included in her opposition brief (Dkt. # 17) and motion to reconsider (Dkt. # 22) demonstrate  
3 that she has alleged a plausible injury in fact under the Article III standing analysis. The Court  
4 disagrees. Although Isaacson has included a variety of non-binding and factually inapposite  
5 cases in her briefing, none of these cases allow for a different result. Indeed, by Isaacson's own  
6 admission, the injury she alleges is a speculative, "potential" future harm. *See* Dkt. # 22 at 5 ("I  
7 do not believe the Court can state unequivocally that weakening regulation does not create a  
8 concrete injury, and it is not an abstract harm even if it is only potential."). Although "a person  
9 exposed to a risk of future harm may pursue forward-looking, injunctive relief to prevent the  
10 harm from occurring," this "risk of harm" must be "sufficiently imminent and substantial."  
11 *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 594 U.S. ----, 141 S. Ct. 2190, 2210 (2021). Isaacson, in contrast,  
12 has not established any imminent risk of harm. Because Isaacson's alleged injury is neither  
13 actual nor imminent, and is both conjectural and hypothetical, the Court concludes that she has  
14 not met her burden to demonstrate that the Court's prior order should be reconsidered.<sup>1</sup>

15 For these reasons, the court DENIES Isaacson's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 22.)

16 Dated this 31st day of October, 2023.

17 

18 John H. Chun  
19 United States District Judge

20  
21  
22  
23 <sup>1</sup> In the remaining portions of her motion to reconsider, Isaacson continues to litigate the merits  
24 of her claims. Yet because Isaacson lacks Article III standing, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction  
and may not consider her underlying claims. *See* Dkt. # 21 at 6 (citing cases).